



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

peace. In 1901 he, with Mr. Dunant, was first to receive the Nobel prize in recognition of his services. He is now past eighty-five years of age and almost blind, but his interest in the cause is as deep and fresh as ever, and he is universally loved and honored by all those who have known him and seen his noble, self-sacrificing and tireless labors in the cause of international goodwill and concord. — ED.]

The older one grows, the more one feels the moment approaching when the record of the short moments which have been allotted to us here below shall be definitely closed, and the more one inevitably turns toward the past, which it might seem ought to have been effaced in its remoteness, so much the more does one try, by reviving in the memory the details which were yesterday forgotten, to judge one's self and to pronounce in advance one's own sentence.

During these last days, among other evidences of my bygone years, among the most precious documents of my youth and my mature age, I have had read to me the admirable letters, which I have preserved, of the kindly and sensible man of whom I was for fifty years the principal and almost only preoccupation; of him who, in his long and sad widowhood, was at the same time my father and my mother, coupling with his strength and clearness of vision in counsel and direction the delicate tenderness of a soul at once feminine and masculine. I found written in the month of July, 1867, at the time when the confidence of my friends, Arles Dufour, Jean Dolfus, Gratry, Michel Chevalier, had just imposed upon me the difficult function of General Secretary of the Permanent International Peace League, these lines, filled at the same time with sympathy for the work and with doubt about the efficaciousness of the efforts which it was about to demand of me:

"I have read the program of the League, and I ask myself, not what is your aim, but what means you will take to attain it? What will you do if the government believes it ought to make war, and what will you have to do if we continue in peace? I see an honest philosophical principle, but nothing to make it succeed. In free trade there is a definite end, a material one; in the League of Peace I see nothing but an idea.

"In the effort to bring about the abolition of corporal constraint and of the death penalty there is something which may be realized, whether one be opposed to it or not. In the League of Peace I do not see what the result can be, or at least the form in which you can secure its realization. There is not in it a point of law to be suppressed or modified; there is nothing. No Prince or Minister will draw up for you a plan of action, and you must abstain from politics, for you would be disturbers."

A little later, writing to her whom he congratulated himself always on having been able to secure for me as a companion, and whom he loved, I can say, for her own sake as much as for mine, he expressed for her his fear that this campaign would be, both in labor and expense, too heavy for my strength and my resources; and he reminded her that if we have (which he was far from failing to recognize) duties towards our fellowmen, we also have duties first of all to our own family, and that I ought not, in order to make myself the defender of unknown persons, to risk compromising, along with my own comfort, the well-being of my children.

This solicitude was, alas, only too well founded, and if I had been able to guess what the effort to accomplish

this Sisyphean task to which I was about to be forever condemned would cost my fortune, that is, what it would cost that of my wife and the comfort of my children, my health, my eyesight and my tranquillity, never, no, never, would I have had the courage to allow myself to enter upon it. Neither my wife, whose encouragement alone has been sufficient to sustain me against trials and failures, nor my children, brought up by her to depend only on labor and to put duty above all exterior satisfactions, have at any time ever thought of reproaching me for the sacrifice whose burden fell upon them. But often, I must avow, I have asked myself whether they would not have been justified in doing so, and if, in comparing the place which I have made for them in the world with that which I might have made for them, I have not failed in my paternal obligations.

In this matter most certainly the fears of my excellent father were far from being chimerical. It is not a life without labor which I have prepared for my descendants. But, on the other hand, how surprised, how happy and how proud, perhaps, he would be, if he could see what progress we have made and what results we have obtained in this undertaking, thankless, and in appearance without result, in which he hesitated to see me engaged! Certainly the task is not yet finished. Will it ever be? Divisions, competitions, jealousies and distrust still exist, threatening still every hour the world with new troubles and necessitating incessant expenses. Nevertheless, what a difference there is between the ancient and the present condition of things! What a general condemnation of international violence and governmental cupidities there is! What a desire for, and more frequent and more beneficent practice each day of, a justice superior to the ancient and precarious law of might! What a beneficent and powerful aspiration now prevails toward the recognition of an international justice worthy of this name! And what effective demonstrations of the possibility of establishing for the nations, as for their citizens, a common jurisdiction which shall declare and perform that which is right, and gradually displace, or rather regulate and discipline, force!

Was I wrong, almost half a century ago, in not despairing of the human race? And if in certain respects I may have merited reproach, and even been able to reproach myself, may I not at least plead extenuating circumstances?

### Disarmament in Germany.

BY DR. A. GOBAT.

Dr. Gobat, the Secretary of the International Peace Bureau at Berne, writes as follows in the issue of the *Correspondance Bimensuelle* for November, 1910. His observations are well worth the consideration of not only all our friends in Germany, but in all other countries. We do not know whether his proposed settlement of the Alsace-Lorraine question could be worked out in practice, but it is at any rate worth considering. Dr. Gobat says:

May I be permitted to make an observation, in a thoroughly friendly spirit, to the German Peace Society? In view of the great interest which the pacifists show in the subject of disarmament, I feel myself compelled to oppose

an idea, sterile, it seems to me, to which a decisive importance might be attached in the grave question of the limitation of armaments.

The German Peace Society has decided to address a petition to the imperial government with a view of inducing it to take into consideration the reduction of military expenditures. This step does the society honor, the more because the idea to which it is giving its sanction is not popular in all governmental circles in Germany. But our friends have added to their praiseworthy proposition a restriction which, from the double point of view of the form and the essence, seems to be essentially opposed to the noble end which they are seeking to attain. They have added to their request in favor of disarmament the idea that Germany could not listen to this proposal except on one condition, namely, the guarantee by the powers of the integrity of its territory.

Was it opportune at the very beginning to anticipate the objections which the German government would not fail to make to the representations of the Peace Society? The government would probably have other objections to formulate, and there was no need of suggesting any to it. But let us leave aside this detail, which belongs rather to the form, and examine the meaning of this territorial guarantee.

The question has been under consideration a long time; and at the peace congresses and the interparliamentary conferences the idea of a reciprocal guarantee of the territorial integrity of states has been recommended as being of such a nature as to render general disarmament possible. Nevertheless, it would be unfortunate for the many pacifists of good intention to waste their time in working for such a guarantee, in order to make of it the pivot of a campaign for disarmament; for this guarantee would never be accepted as sufficient, even if it obtained the formal assent solemnly given by general agreement of the states. Why? Because it would be impossible, altogether impossible, to procure for it a means of enforcement, and because in these conditions each state would have to consider its own defensive national force as the best guarantee of its territorial integrity. How many countries have found out by experience that guarantees of this kind do not deserve entire confidence; for instance, Switzerland, among others, whose neutrality has several times been menaced by the very powers which have sworn to respect it.

Nevertheless, in spite of the objections which I am raising against the formula for disarmament put forward by the German Peace Society, one cannot fail to recognize that there is in this question of territorial guarantee, in particular so far as concerns disarmament in Germany, a basis of reality and of truth. This formula, translated into clear, frank, concrete language, signifies the following: Germany would consent to disarmament on condition that the peaceable possession of Alsace-Lorraine were guaranteed to her. As we have just seen, such a guarantee would belong to the domain of sentimental politics, and be without any efficacious sanction. But the German empire might procure for itself a serious guarantee of this possession. It has it in its own hand. This would be the autonomy of Alsace-Lorraine. Let it allow, in a word, the new nation, incorporated into the German confederation, to proceed to its own political organization as a state of the empire, and not only all resentment arising

out of the events of forty years ago would be effaced, but, still further, the autonomy of her former province would give to France a satisfaction which, by reason of her dignity and because of the feeling of her responsibility toward the European family, she would hasten to accept. Alsace-Lorraine in its turn, by obtaining in the empire an honorable political position equal to that of the German countries, and preserved forever from the sad fate which was so long hers, that of serving as a battlefield for Europe, would have nothing further to desire.

Thus, without demanding of the powers an illusory guarantee, by a simple act of justice and equity toward a nation remarkable for its intellectual culture and its industrial genius, Germany would have created in the political psychology of states a new stage which would allow her even to take the initiative in the limitation of armaments.

### Japan and America.

Mr. M. Zumoto, formerly editor of the *Seoul Press* and now the Director of the Oriental Information Agency in New York, is one of the best informed and sensible among the Japanese public men, and his opinion may be regarded as an expression of the views held by the leading officials and representative men of the country.

At a recent dinner given by the Business Manager of the *New York World* at the Imperial Hotel in Tokyo he spoke as follows:

Referring to the Americans as a people, Mr. Zumoto said they were full of energy and enterprise, kind, open-hearted and extremely candid. While their manners were so different from the Japanese, yet they were the most charitable people he ever came in contact with.

As regards the war talk that continues to be cabled over to Japan and *vice versa*, before he left Japan for the United States he believed an armed conflict inevitable, but after he got there he found every one, from statesmen and financiers to newspaper men, scouting the idea of such a possibility. He found it confined to a small section, a group of men who were for the creation of a large navy, so that they might profit by the building of the ships, or by a small group in Wall Street; but that the general public were always guided by common sense. He had the good fortune to travel with the Commerce Commissioners, and he knew the reception accorded them in fifty-four cities, large and small, throughout the country, was not a matter of arrangement, not from the committees, but spontaneous and cordial from the general public, and not the least of this spirit was displayed in California. No sensible people took any notice of the one set of papers that have been devoting so much space to this war talk. Here Mr. Zumoto paid a compliment to the *New York World* as having done much to counteract the set of papers owned by Mr. Wm. R. Hearst.

Japan, continued the speaker, has no design on any of the American possessions. Hawaii, which is without doubt very prosperous, and has afforded an outlet for our many Japanese colonists, would not prove an advantage or an addition to Japan, but a menace and a drag on its resources. It would require a large military and naval force, consuming and scattering their defensive forces, and prove not only a menace but an actual weakness. As to the Philippines, the general supposition that because